



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,876	05/22/2007	Jacques Sagne	P19258-US1	7342
27045	7590	03/27/2012	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			03/27/2012	DELIVERY MODE
				ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,876	SAGNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIE J. DANIEL JR	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 34-67 is/are pending in the application.
 - 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 34-67 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 08 December 2010. **Claims 34-67** are now pending in the present application and **claims 1-33** are canceled. This office action is made **Non-Final**.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on

a. 02 May 2011

is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and is being considered by the examiner.

The IDS (see at least item 2a above) included reference document(s) that was/were lined through (or crossed-out) and have not been considered by the Examiner. Reasons for not considering the documents are at the least the following:

- i. The IDS failed to provide a **date** (e.g., month/year) as required by 37 CFR 1.98(b)(5).

See MPEP § 609.04(a)(I). [**37 CFR 1.98(b)** requires that each item of information in an IDS be identified properly...The **date of publication** supplied **must include at least the month and year** of publication, **except that the year** of publication (**without the month**) **will be accepted if the applicant points out in the information disclosure statement that the year of publication is sufficiently earlier** than the effective U.S. filing and any foreign priority date...]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim 65 recites the limitation "...**the** radio network controller..." in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 65 refers to different radio network controller. For example, claim 65 recites "...a potential **drift** radio network controller..." in lines 2 & 12; and "...**other** radio network controllers..." in lines 4 & 10-11; and "...a **servicing** radio network controller..." in line 8.

Regarding **claim 65**, the claims recite language that is not clear and concise in which the Examiner respectfully request the applicant to clarify the claims. If the applicant considers the current language to be sufficient, the Examiner respectfully requests page(s), line(s), and/or drawing(s) of the instant application that supports the claim language and any supportive comment(s) to help clarify and resolve this issue(s).

4. Due to the 112 rejection of the current claim language, the Examiner has given a reasonable interpretation of said language and the claims are rejected as broadest and best interpreted. In addition, applicant is welcomed to point out where in the specification the Examiner can find support for this language if Applicant believes otherwise.
5. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34-35, 37-40, 42, 47-53, 58-63, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Choi et al.** (hereinafter Choi-A) (**WO 2004/064342 A1**) in view of **Rune et al.** (hereinafter Rune) (**US 6,618,589 B1**) and **Kovacs et al.** (hereinafter Kovacs) (**US 7,215,958 B2**).

Regarding **claims 34, 51, and 62**, Choi-A discloses a method in a radio access network of handling the mobility of a multimedia service (e.g., MBMS) joined mobile terminal in a cell group location state { (see pg. 6, lines 31-34; pg. 9, lines 9-10; Figs. 1-5) } comprising the steps of:

performing an information transfer at a first trigger event via an Iur-interface between a serving radio network controller (SRNC) and all radio network controllers controlling at least one cell in a first cell group (e.g., target cell) and being potential drift radio network controllers (DRNCs) (e.g., T RNC target RNC) for the mobile terminal { (see pg. 9, lines 15-19; Figs. 2 & 4-5), where the SRNC communicates a connection request with target RNC (T RNC / DRNC) (see pg. 8, lines 14-16) },

wherein the cell group location state stores the location of the mobile terminal at cell group level { (see pg. 4, lines 8-20), where the system has a message with a location (e.g., cell ID) (see pg. 4, lines 27-31) };

the information transfer { (see pg. 9, lines 15-19; pg. 4, lines 15-20) } step comprises the further steps of

sending, by the SRNC, a multimedia service attach requesting message (e.g., MBMS connection request) to the more than one potential DRNC, the multimedia service attach requesting message comprising context information for the mobile terminal, the context information including multimedia service information { (see pg. 9, lines 15-19; pg. 4, lines 15-20; Figs. 2 & 4-5), where the system has a SRNC transmit a MBMS connection request to a target RNC (DRNC) }; and

creating and storing, by the potential DRNCs, a context for the mobile terminal based on the received message { (see pg. 10, lines 27-29; Figs. 2 & 4-5), where the configuration is completed }.

Choi-A does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state stores the location of the mobile terminal at cell group level and the location is stored in a context of a radio network controller functioning as the SRNC for the mobile terminal; and sending, by the SRNC, a service attach requesting message to the more than one potential DRNC. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state stores the location of the mobile terminal at cell group level and the location is stored in a context of a radio network controller functioning as the SRNC for the mobile terminal was well known in the art, as taught by Rune.

In the same field of endeavor, Rune discloses the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state stores the location of the mobile terminal at cell group level and the location is stored in a context of a radio network controller functioning as the SRNC for the mobile

terminal { (see col. 6, lines 59-61; col. 8, lines 3-5,14-23), where the SRNC receives and stores the Cell-Update message or URA-Update message }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A and Rune to have the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state stores the location of the mobile terminal at cell group level and the location is stored in a context of a radio network controller functioning as the SRNC for the mobile terminal, in order to provide a method for performing Cell- or URA-Updates whereby an SRNC can maintain accurate information about the location of a UE, as taught by Rune (see col. 6, lines 1-6).

The combination of Choi-A and Rune does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) sending, by the SRNC, a service attach requesting message to the more than one potential DRNC. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) sending, by the SRNC, a service attach requesting message to the more than one potential DRNC was well known in the art, as taught by Kovacs.

In the same field of endeavor, Kovacs discloses the feature(s) sending, by the SRNC (e.g., service IP-BTS 20), a service attach requesting message to the more than one potential DRNC (e.g., IP-BTS 21-22) { (see col. 4, line 65 - col. 5, line 2; col. 5, lines 43-45,50-61; col. 8, lines 7-10,14-21; Fig. 1a & 3), where the system has IP-BTS (20) that provides relocation specific information to IP-BTS 21 and IP-BTS 22 }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs to have the feature(s) sending, by the SRNC, a service attach requesting message to the more than one

potential DRNC, in order to provide a relocation procedure by means of which radio performance can be improved, as taught by Kovacs (see col. 2, lines 12-15).

Regarding **claims 35, 52, and 63**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the transferred context information comprises the identity of the joined multimedia service, the identity of the cell group, the temporary identity of the mobile terminal within the network, and the identity of the mobile terminal { (see pg. 9, lines 15-19) }.

Regarding **claim 37**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the trigger event is the SRNC receiving a cell group updating message from the mobile terminal { (see pg. 9, lines 9-19) }.

Regarding **claims 38 and 53**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 37), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 37, further comprising the steps of: sending a multimedia service detach requesting message from the SRNC to all potential DRNCs in the previous cell group, if the new cell group comprises only cells controlled by new RNCs { (see pg. 9, lines 15-19) }; and

deleting, by the potential DRNCs in the previous cell group, the stored context of the mobile terminal { (see pg. 11, lines 5-7) }.

Regarding **claim 39**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the

method according to claim 34, wherein the trigger event is the mobile terminal transiting into the cell group location state from any other state { (see pg. 11, lines 9-16) }.

Regarding **claim 40**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the trigger event is the SRNC receiving a notification (e.g., survey report) from the core network of a start of a multimedia service session { (see pg. 5, lines 10-19) }.

Regarding **claim 42**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the multimedia service context comprises the identity of the multimedia service and the temporary identity of the mobile terminal within the radio access network { (see pg. 8, lines 14-16) }.

Regarding **claims 47 and 58**, Choi-A does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein the first cell group consists of a UTRAN Registration Area (URA) according to the 3GPP standard. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein the first cell group consists of a UTRAN Registration Area (URA) according to the 3GPP standard was well known in the art, as taught by Rune.

Rune further discloses the feature(s) wherein the first cell group consists of a UTRAN Registration Area (URA) according to the 3GPP standard { (see col. 6, lines 59-61; col. 7, lines 58-60; col. 8, lines 3-5,14-23; Fig. 10), where the SRNC receives and stores the Cell-Update message or URA-Update message }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs to have the feature(s) wherein the first cell group consists of a UTRAN Registration Area (URA) according to the 3GPP standard, in order to provide a method for performing Cell- or URA-Updates whereby an SRNC can maintain accurate information about the location of a UE, as taught by Rune (see col. 6, lines 1-6).

Regarding **claims 48 and 59**, Choi-A does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state is a URA_PCH state according to the 3GPP standard. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state is a URA_PCH state according to the 3GPP standard was well known in the art, as taught by Rune.

Rune further discloses the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state is a URA_PCH state according to the 3GPP standard { (see col. 6, lines 59-61; col. 7, lines 58-60; col. 8, lines 3-5,14-23; Fig. 10), where the SRNC receives and stores the Cell-Update message or URA-Update message }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs to have the feature(s) wherein the cell group location state is a URA_PCH state according to the 3GPP standard, in order to provide a method for performing Cell- or URA-Updates whereby an SRNC can maintain accurate information about the location of a UE, as taught by Rune (see col. 6, lines 1-6).

Regarding **claims 49 and 60**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the multimedia service is a Multimedia Broadcasting/Multicasting Service (MBMS), according to the 3GPP standard { (see pg. 8, lines 7-9) }.

Regarding **claims 50 and 61**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 34), in addition Choi-A further discloses the method according to claim 34, wherein the multimedia service attach requesting message is an MBMS ATTACH REQUEST (e.g., MBMS Connection Request, according to the 3GPP standard { (see pg. 8, lines 7-9,14-16,20-23; Figs. 2 & 4-5) }.

Regarding **claim 67**, Choi-A does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) notifying the SRNC of the location of the mobile terminal only when the mobile terminal moves from the first cell group to a second cell group, wherein the first cell group comprises a plurality of cells; and maintaining the location of the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal moves between the plurality of cells of the first cell group. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) notifying the SRNC of the location of the mobile terminal only when the mobile terminal moves from the first cell group to a second cell group, wherein the first cell group comprises a plurality of cells; and maintaining the location of the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal moves between the plurality of cells of the first cell group was well known in the art, as taught by Rune.

Rune further discloses the feature(s) notifying the SRNC of the location of the mobile terminal only when the mobile terminal moves from the first cell group to a second cell

group, wherein the first cell group comprises a plurality of cells; and maintaining the location of the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal moves between the plurality of cells of the first cell group { (see col. 6, lines 59-61; col. 7, lines 58-60; col. 8, lines 3-5,14-23; Fig. 10), where the SRNC receives and stores the Cell-Update message or URA-Update message }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs to have the feature(s) notifying the SRNC of the location of the mobile terminal only when the mobile terminal moves from the first cell group to a second cell group, wherein the first cell group comprises a plurality of cells; and maintaining the location of the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal moves between the plurality of cells of the first cell group, in order to provide a method for performing Cell- or URA-Updates whereby an SRNC can maintain accurate information about the location of a UE, as taught by Rune (see col. 6, lines 1-6).

Claims 36, 41, and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Choi et al.** (hereinafter Choi-A) (**WO 2004/064342 A1**) in view of **Rune et al.** (hereinafter Rune) (**US 6,618,589 B1**) and **Kovacs et al.** (hereinafter Kovacs) (**US 7,215,958 B2**) as applied to claims 34 and 62 above, and further in view of **Choi et al.** (hereinafter Choi-B) (**US 2004/0180675 A1**).

Regarding **claims 36 and 64**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein the SRNC and the potential DRNCs will send a multimedia session start notification based on the transferred context information when a multimedia session start notification is received from a core network. However, the

examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein the SRNC and the potential DRNCs will send a multimedia session start notification based on the transferred context information when a multimedia session start notification is received from a core network was well known in the art, as taught by Choi-B.

In the same field of endeavor, Choi-B discloses the feature(s) wherein the SRNC and the potential DRNCs will send a multimedia session start notification based on the transferred context information when a multimedia session start notification is received from a core network { (see pg. 10, [0127]; Figs. 3-4 & 8 ‘ref. 809’), where the CN provides notification }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, Kovacs, and Choi-B to have the feature(s) wherein the SRNC and the potential DRNCs will send a multimedia session start notification based on the transferred context information when a multimedia session start notification is received from a core network, in order to provide a method for transmitting and receiving a control message in a mobile communication system supporting an MBMS service, as taught by Choi-B (see pg. 5, [0043]).

Regarding **claim 41 and 65**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) wherein each of the potential DRNCs create and store a multimedia service context in case no other multimedia service joined mobile terminal is located in the cells controlled by each potential DRNC. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) wherein each of the potential DRNCs create and store a multimedia service context in case no other multimedia service joined mobile terminal is

located in the cells controlled by each potential DRNC was well known in the art, as taught by Choi-B.

Choi-B further discloses the feature(s) wherein each of the potential DRNCs create and store a multimedia service context in case no other multimedia service joined mobile terminal is located in the cells controlled by each potential DRNC { (see pg. 10, [0127]; Figs. 3-4 & 8 ‘ref. 809’), where the CN provides notification }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, Kovacs, and Choi-B to have the feature(s) wherein each of the potential DRNCs create and store a multimedia service context in case no other multimedia service joined mobile terminal is located in the cells controlled by each potential DRNC, in order to provide a method for transmitting and receiving a control message in a mobile communication system supporting an MBMS service, as taught by Choi-B (see pg. 5, [0043]).

Regarding **claim 66**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 65), in addition Choi-A further discloses the radio network controller according to claim 65, wherein the multimedia service context comprises the identity of the multimedia service and the temporary identity of the mobile terminal within the radio network { (see pg. 9, lines 23-26) }.

Claims 43-46 and 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Choi et al.** (hereinafter Choi-A) (**WO 2004/064342 A1**) in view of **Rune et al.** (hereinafter Rune) (**US 6,618,589 B1**) and **Kovacs et al.** (hereinafter Kovacs) (**US 7,215,958 B2**) as applied to claims 34 and 51 above, and further in view of **Lee et al.** (hereinafter Lee) (**US 2005/0041610 A1**).

Regarding **claims 43 and 54**, Choi-A does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) performing a counting procedure for each cell before a PTM/PTP decision by radio network controllers functioning as Controlling Radio Network Controllers (CRNCs). As a note, Rune discloses of a counting procedure { (see col. 6, lines 59-61) }. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) performing a counting procedure for each cell before a PTM/PTP decision by radio network controllers functioning as Controlling Radio Network Controllers (CRNCs) was well known in the art, as taught by Lee.

In the same field of endeavor, Lee discloses the feature(s) performing a counting procedure for each cell before a PTM/PTP decision by radio network controllers functioning as Controlling Radio Network Controllers (CRNCs) { (see pg. 4, [0054]; Fig. 4), where the system has RNC that is the controlling RNC }.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Choi-A, Rune, Kovacs, and Lee to have the feature(s) performing a counting procedure for each cell before a PTM/PTP decision by radio network controllers functioning as Controlling Radio Network Controllers (CRNCs), in order to provide a method and apparatus for accurately counting, as taught by Lee (see pg. 3, [0032]).

Regarding **claim 44 and 55**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 43), in addition Choi-A further discloses the radio network controller according to claim 43, wherein the counting procedure step is performed by paging each mobile terminal in the cell group location state individually by means of the stored context information { (see pg. 6, [0078]) }.

Regarding **claim 45 and 56**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 43), in addition Choi-A further discloses the radio network controller according to claim 43, wherein the counting procedure step is performed by including a cell group location specific paging information comprising a probability factor in a broadcasted multimedia service session start notification { (see pg. 6, [0077-0078]) }.

Regarding **claim 46 and 57**, the combination of Choi-A, Rune, and Kovacs discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 43), in addition Choi-A further discloses the radio network controller according to claim 43, wherein the counting procedure step is performed by estimating a probability factor for the mobile terminals of each cell { (see pg. 7, [0090]) }.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the amended language, new limitations, and/or new claims.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations and comments in this section).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIE J. DANIEL JR whose telephone number is (571)272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WILLIE J DANIEL JR/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

WJD,Jr
20 March 2012